

REMARKS

The Final Office Action mailed February 13, 2008, has been received and reviewed. Claims 1 through 20 are currently pending in the application, of which claims 1 through 3, and 12 through 20 are currently under examination. Claims 4 through 11 are withdrawn from consideration as being drawn to a non-elected invention. Claims 1 through 3, and 12 through 20 stand rejected. Applicant proposes to amend claims 1, 15 and 16, and respectfully request reconsideration of the application as proposed to be amended herein.

Claims 1 and 15 are proposed to be amended to address the Examiner's concerns as expressed in the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, and not to surrender any scope of the claims. The proposed amendment to claim 16 is solely to correct a spelling error.

35 U.S.C. § 112 Claim Rejections

Claims 1 through 3, and 12 through 20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as containing subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor, at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection, as hereinafter set forth.

In the interest of expediting the examination process, Applicant proposes to amend independent claims 1 and 15 herein. Independent claims 1 and 15 have been amended only to restate the prior language of the claims in an order more appropriate to the claimed method, so as to avoid limitations unintended by the Applicant being read into the claims, and not to modify the scope of the claims. Although the grammatical arrangement of limitations within the claims has been amended, this is only to promote clarity, and does not mean or imply, or constitute an admission that some of the acts set forth in the claimed methods could not be performed in several different orders or sequences, or concurrently.

“An applicant shows possession of the claimed invention *by describing the claimed invention with all of its limitations* using such descriptive means as words, structures, figures, diagram, and formulas that fully set forth the claimed invention.” MPEP §2163.02 (emphasis added) (citing Lockwood v. American Airlines, Inc., 107 F.3d 1565, 1572, 41 USPQ2d 1961,

1966 (Fed. Cir. 1997)). In the present case, each of the limitations of the claims is described in the as-filed application.

The “sizing, configuring, and positioning” limitations of claims 1 and 15 are supported by the as-filed specification at least at paragraphs [0033] and [0039] with reference to FIGS. 4 and 9A in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor, at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

The “removing at least a portion of the dielectric material from the substrate along the longitudinal axis of the substrate” limitations of claims 1 and 15 are supported by the as-filed specification at least at paragraphs [0032]-[0033] with reference to FIGS. 4 and 9A in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor, at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

Additionally, Applicant reasserts the arguments made in the Amendment filed on December 14, 2007.

The proposed restatement of the claim language in each of claims 1 and 15 herein renders it abundantly clear, without any admission that the prior claim language was in any case unclear, that the recitation of “removing at least a portion of the dielectric material from the substrate along the longitudinal axis of the substrate” in claims 1 and 15, as well as the recitation of “positioning at least one crosspiece substantially transverse to the longitudinal axis of the substrate” in claim 1 and the recitation of “positioning the plurality of crosspieces substantially transverse to the longitudinal axis of the substrate” in claim 15 are in furtherance of the recited acts of “sizing, configuring and positioning a first segment of the elongated multisegmented interconnect slot and at least a second segment of the elongated multisegmented interconnect slot” in claim 1 and “sizing, configuring and positioning each of a plurality of segments of the elongated multisegmented slot” in claim 15, respectively. In other words, forming the multisegmented slot as recited in each of claims 1 and 15 is facilitated by acts further comprising the removal of at least a portion of the dielectric material of the substrate and in positioning at least one (claim 1) crosspiece or a plurality of (claims 15) crosspieces. Accordingly, there can remain no question as to the scope and content Applicant’s claimed method.

For the reasons set forth above, Applicant respectfully asserts that the subject matter of the claims was described in the as-filed specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the art that the inventor had possession of the claimed invention at the time the application was filed. Applicant therefore requests that the Examiner withdraw the rejection of claims 1 through 3, and 12 through 20 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph.

ENTRY OF AMENDMENTS

The proposed amendments to claims 1, 15 and 16 above should be entered by the Examiner because the amendments are supported by the as-filed specification and drawings and do not add any new matter to the application. Further, the amendments do not raise new issues or require a further search. Finally, if the Examiner determines that the amendments do not place the application in condition for allowance, entry is respectfully requested upon filing of a Notice of Appeal herein. Applicant respectfully notes that presently withdrawn claims 4 through 11 would be allowable with the allowance of claim 1.

CONCLUSION

Claims 1 through 20 are believed to be in condition for allowance, and an early notice thereof is respectfully solicited. Should the Examiner determine that additional issues remain which might be resolved by a telephone conference, the Examiner is respectfully invited to contact Applicant's undersigned attorney.

Respectfully submitted,



Joseph A. Walkowski
Registration No. 28,765
Attorney for Applicant

TRASKBRITT
P.O. Box 2550
Salt Lake City, Utah 84110-2550
Telephone: 801-532-1922

Date: March 13, 2008

JA W/dlm:slm

Document in ProLaw